

University of Montana

## ScholarWorks at University of Montana

---

University of Montana Course Syllabi

Open Educational Resources (OER)

---

Fall 9-1-2021

### PSYX 525.01: Psychological Evaluation I

Gregory R. Machek

*University of Montana, Missoula*, [greg.machek@umontana.edu](mailto:greg.machek@umontana.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/syllabi>

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

---

#### Recommended Citation

Machek, Gregory R., "PSYX 525.01: Psychological Evaluation I" (2021). *University of Montana Course Syllabi*. 12073.

<https://scholarworks.umt.edu/syllabi/12073>

This Syllabus is brought to you for free and open access by the Open Educational Resources (OER) at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Montana Course Syllabi by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@mso.umt.edu](mailto:scholarworks@mso.umt.edu).

## Syllabus

### Psyx 525: Psychological Evaluation I

Fall 2021

**Meeting Location and Times:**

Skaggs 246

Mon: 9:30-10:50

Wed: 9:30-10:50

“Optional” Q&A/Hands On Lab: Time & place TBA

**Instructor:** Greg Machek, Ph.D.

**Email:** [greg.machek@umontana.edu](mailto:greg.machek@umontana.edu)

**Office:** Skaggs Bldg., rm. 240

**Office Hours:** Monday: 11:00-12:00, and by Appointment

**Teaching Assistant:** Emily Brooke

**Email:** [emily.brooke@umontana.edu](mailto:emily.brooke@umontana.edu)

**Office Hours:** By Appt.

**Mailbox:** Hand paper assignments (reports, protocols) into me at class (I'll also put a box in the main office to hand them in). I will hand paper assignments back to you via your student mailboxes in student computer lab. Videos will be shared over UMBox and Emily, our TA will go over that with you.

**Required Texts:**

Sattler, J.M., (2018). *Assessment of Children: Cognitive Foundations and Applications*, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition. San Diego, CA: Jerome M. Sattler, Publisher, Inc.: La Mesa, CA

Sattler, J.M. & Ryan, J.J. (2009). *Assessment with the WAIS-IV*. Jerome M. Sattler, Publisher, Inc.: La Mesa, CA

**Additional Readings (Moodle):**

Additional readings – or other material- will be available on Moodle.

**Recommended Texts:**

Weiss, L.G., Saklofske, D.H., Holdnack, J.A., & Prifitera, A. (2016). *WISC-V Assessment and Interpretation: Scientist-Practitioner Perspectives*. London: Elsevier, Inc.

Lichtenberger, E. O., & Kaufman, A. S. (2009). *Essentials of WAIS-IV Assessment*. New York: Wiley.

Barram, R. A. & Roid, G. H. (2004). Essentials of Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales (SBV) Assessment. Hoboken, NJ : Wiley.

### **COVID Information and Protocols**

As you know, guidance on Covid safety and mitigation efforts is not only fluid (changing as the data does), but also comes from multiple sources. In order to keep all of us on campus informed, the University has a website with links to information that gets updated regularly. Instead of changing the syllabus every time a change is registered on the university site, please check the [university COVID site](#) frequently for updates and official information and guidance. In addition, please pay attention to official information coming to your official University email accounts regarding updated guidance. Here is the [most recent guidance on classroom expectations/requirements](#) as of 8/27/2021.

### **Updated August 20, 2021**

All individuals on the UM campus are strongly encouraged to wear masks in indoor public settings.

Masks are required on campus in the following areas:

- Classrooms and laboratory settings;
- Curry Health Center;
- Clinical settings within the College of Health;
- UDASH and Mountain Line Busses (as required by the Transportation Security Administration)

All students, employees and visitors can pick up disposable or reusable masks at a variety of locations across the campus, including most student services offices and the Griz Card office in the University Center.

Therefore, masks are required in classrooms and labs. Social distancing is NOT required at this point, but since we are small in number in a rather large room, I ask that everyone does try to maintain a 6ft distance during lectures. This will obviously not be possible when practicing test administration. When doing the latter, it is advised that people wear gloves or at least make sure to avoid touching their face and follow adequate hand hygiene often.

### **Purpose and Rationale**

The main objective of this course is for students to develop competency in the use, scoring, interpretation, and write-up of commonly used tests of cognitive abilities. Students will further develop initial competence and familiarity with other cognitive measures that they may be asked to administer in professional settings.

**Learning Goals:**

1. Acquire skill in the competent administration, scoring, and interpretation of several individual tests of cognitive functioning
2. Understand the history of intelligence testing
3. To understand the legal issues related to the administration and interpretation of intelligence tests
4. Understand practical uses of intelligence testing, including their limitations
5. Exhibit proficiency in relaying assessments results
6. To train practitioners who use a scientific approach to evaluation and who understand the theoretical and empirical underpinnings of the construct of intelligence
7. To understand issues in administration and interpretation when assessing members of minority groups and exceptional populations
8. Understand intelligence test terminology; sources of error in intelligence testing, psychometric properties, standardization of intelligence tests, and appropriate uses of measures of intelligence

**Materials:**

You will need:

1. Get some manilla envelopes in which to hand in protocols & reports together.
2. A stopwatch is needed for some testing applications. Use should be quiet and unobtrusive. Almost everyone uses their smartphones. Just make sure that the timer is silent and is also visually unobtrusive/non-distracting.
3. Some people prefer to use clipboards for their protocols.

**UMBox:**

As said, above, you will all need to use UMBox to upload and share administration videos. Emily, our TA, will be a point person on troubleshooting this with each of you. UMBox is HIPAA compliant.

**A Note on Academic Misconduct:**

All students must exercise academic honesty. Academic misconduct is subject to an academic penalty by the course instructor and/or disciplinary sanction by the University. All students need to be familiar with the Student Conduct Code. [The Code is available online at the Dean of Students' website.](#)

Additionally, I should point out that it would be entirely possible for you to fabricate a non-videotaped protocol. In other words, you could just supply your own answers, score them, etc. Don't do it. It is unethical and would lead to a failure of the class, and possibly and ultimately, dismissal from the program. It is not worth it. This class is intensive in terms of its demands, and these demands come at a point in your graduate experience when it may be difficult to juggle all of your obligations. If you are having trouble meeting all of your obligations, talk to your advisor, the chair, another departmental

faculty with whom you can confide and take guidance from, etc. But don't consider shortcuts that would undermine your chosen profession and your future in it.

### **Students with Disabilities:**

The University of Montana assures equal access to instruction through collaboration between students with disabilities, instructors, and the [Office for Disability Equity \(ODE\)](#). If you think you may have a disability adversely affecting your academic performance, and you have not already registered with Disability Services, please contact ODE in Lommasson Center 154 or call 406.243.2243. I will work with you and ODE to provide appropriate accommodations. Also, my understanding is that any accommodations around Covid concerns (cannot make class in-person, etc.) need to go through ODE as well.

### **Withdrawal from Course:**

The 15<sup>th</sup> day of class is usually the last day to drop the course with a full refund (although, always check the Registrar's site for specific dates). For the next two weeks, students can drop with instructor and advisor signature. Dropping after that point requires a petition.

## **COURSE REQUIREMENTS:**

### **Basic:**

#### **Attendance & Participation:**

Attendance is required. Lectures and class activities will be important to the overall learning experience and cannot be made up. You are expected to contribute to the class through discussion and questions. In some instances, I may have you prepare something for a future class. For example, I may give you specific questions to consider for subsequent readings. I expect that you will have done so and will be prepared to discuss.

If absence is unavoidable, please let me know ahead of time. *Unexcused absences may certainly impact your progress in the class and your final grade.*

I also may need to take attendance for the class and also have people sit in assigned spots (the same desk each time we have class) during classes when we cannot abide by distancing guidelines. This is in order to do any contact tracing, should it become necessary.

### **Testing**

*Changes due to COVID-19:*

The primary goal of this course is to have you develop initial mastery of the administration, scoring, and write-up of cognitive tests. Normally this entails many practice administrations with actual child and adult subjects, most of whom are not fellow students, and students are usually tasked with finding these subjects throughout the semester. Due to our current circumstances, it does not seem prudent to have you locate and administer tests on a large number of people – particularly children - with whom you are not familiar. Therefore, for most administrations, you will be expected to do a number of mock/practice tests with/on each other. NOTE: Emily Brooke (our TA) and myself will make ourselves available as potential testing subjects, too. We will provide scripts for the examinee to use to guide some of their responses. These are not to be discussed/shared as an aid to preparing for an assignment administration. The scripts will be for the WISC-V (child) administrations using and adult classmate (pretending to be a child) only.

*Cleaning and sharing test kits:*

Due to the relatively low number of students in our class for this semester, this will allow almost all of you to have a WISC-V test kit. I will be relaxing the usual rules on having to turn these kits back in to the CPC test closet on a daily basis, at least for the WISC-V kits. This may change depending on our WAIS-IV kit numbers. I will keep you informed.

I ask that you consider following [these procedures for cleaning after each use](#) .

***You will administer and score six (6) assessments, broken down as follows:***

**CHILD FOCUS:**

**School Psychology students and Clinical Students with a professed career interest in working mainly with child (and/or child & family) clients:**

- 4 Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, Fifth Edition (WISC-V)
- 1 Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, Fourth Edition (WAIS-IV)
- 1 Stanford-Binet Scale of Intelligence, Fifth Edition (SB:V)

**\*\*ADULT FOCUS (\*\*This likely does not apply for this year due to the absence of a Clinical cohort):**

**clients:**

**\*4 Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, Fourth Edition (WAIS-IV).** Two of the administrations may be on your cohort members or other Psychology Graduate students (but please do not share results- better yet, have the cohort member “fake it”). Two must be on adults outside of the program. Many times, you will be able to access U of M students through the Psychology Subject Pool, using

SONA- more later). **Do not videotape sessions of the WAIS-IV for which you use other students in the Psychology Graduate program.**

\*(1 of these four will be your "FINAL": 3+1)

1 Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, Fifth Edition (WISC-V).

1 Stanford-Binet Scale of Intelligence, Fifth Edition (SB:V)

**For GRADING purposes, these administration requirements more specifically break down as follows:**

**\*Four (your best 4 scores) are calculated into your final grade at 15 points a piece:**

Your protocols will be evaluated on a 15-point scale (15 = no major errors, 1 point loss for each major error; .33 points for each minor error). Of these five (5) "non-final" scores, your lowest administration score will be dropped, so the rest add up for a total of 60 (4x15) points possible.

*Please note that you can review all of your own protocols for scoring and administration accuracy to catch your mistakes, before turning them in, except on your final administration. If you catch the mistake it will NOT count against you. Simply provide a brief, but clear, note regarding the mistake and your awareness of what you should have done otherwise. Again, however, this does NOT apply to your Final Administration (see below).*

**\*You will videotape three (3) of your administrations and turn them in for grading. These should be on the WISC or WAIS (not the SB-5).**

**\*Written Reports (6 points each: 18 points possible):**

3 of your submissions will have an accompanying brief report (as noted in the schedule).

**\*your 6<sup>th</sup> and last administration will be worth as total of 35 points: 25 for the administration and an extra 10 for the final report (25+10=35). It will also be videotaped.**

This final administration also has to be on your Wechsler scale of emphasis (e.g. the WISC-V for School Psych students). I would like this to be on an actual child that you may have comfortable access to, BUT this needs to be discussed as a class at the beginning of the semester.

***The scoring rubric for this one will include major and minor values twice (2x) that for the other administrations.*** For example, each Major error will count 2 pts, and each minor error, .66 points. You will want this to be one of your best examples. Students encountering seven (7) or more points in deductions on the

administration (i.e., not the report) will need to redo the administration and may risk taking an “incomplete” in the course (actually, since this is so late in the semester, the student will almost certainly need to take an incomplete to give them time to redo an administration).

**Subjects.** The hope is that you can secure one child subject for your final administration (6-17 years of age). These cannot be children who are being evaluated for services OR receiving services. I’d like it to be someone – perhaps a family member- with whom everyone involved is comfortable in the safety of the interaction (i.e. covid considerations). Family members or children of close friends are all possible resources. Do NOT test the same person more than once with the same test. Do NOT use your own child for the videotaped (final) versions. BEFORE testing subjects who are not classmates, you must secure their permission, or, in the case of minors, of their parents or legal guardian(s). Consent forms are on Moodle. Additionally, there is a “letter to parents” on Moodle. It is a letter from me to any prospective parent of a child you test. Please make copies of those. Do not try to recruit subjects at any institution (e.g. hospital, school).

**For WAIS-IV administrations,** you can use a friend/acquaintance or Psyx100 students can be accessed. Skaggs 246 side rooms can be used to do some of these administrations. You will need to sign up to the SONA system to advertise and to give the undergraduate student credit. If you want to do this, tell me and I will forward your name to the SONA people (Dr. Yang and her TA). The contact info is [psychology.sona@umontana.edu](mailto:psychology.sona@umontana.edu). I’ll tell them you need to sign up for a researcher account on SONA for Psyx525. The TA also helps with scheduling. More details to come from Emily and myself.

In general, it is **strongly suggested** that all students give multiple practice assessments to anyone who will sit still before attempting assessments for a grade, using proper safety precautions, of course.

### **Class Presentations:**

These are relatively open in terms of content, though it will need to be something not covered “in depth” during the class. Topics must be relevant to the course. Some ideas include:

- Presenting on an instrument of cognitive ability not covered in class (we have a couple in the test closet, such as the Wechsler Memory Scales, KABC, etc.- please ask);
- Presenting on a research topic of personal interest (e.g. assessing gifted students, cultural bias in IQ testing, use of standardized IQ tests in the assessment of LD, expanding on a particular *theory* of intelligence).
- **Please see larger list of possible topics at the end of the syllabus.**



If done individually, these should take about 25 minutes. You may partner up to do these presentations, though I will expect you to take about 50 minutes if two people are presenting. ***Each presentation should be done using visual aids, such as PowerPoint, and should be accompanied by appropriate hardcopy handouts.*** **Topics for presentation must be submitted by October 6<sup>th</sup>.** We can talk further about format and content during the semester and I will provide a handout of content areas to cover if you are presenting on another test battery (see Moodle for an outline). If you are covering another issue (e.g. giftedness assessment), then I would encourage you to set up a time to discuss your presentation content with me. **Again, please be aware of the time limit and plan accordingly. It does not take too many slides/information to fill 25 minutes.**

***Deadlines.*** Protocols, reports, and observed assessments are to be conducted across the course of the semester. Please see the class schedule for times in which test protocols/reports are due. Lateness will be penalized at a rate of 10% per day late. However, if there are dire circumstances that preclude you from getting them in on time, please talk to me AS SOON AS YOU ARE AWARE OF IT, and we can try to work something out. **You may turn in protocols, reports, and videos early as well.**

**Confidentiality of subjects:** Please note that consent/permission forms (for the final and your WAIS-IV) need to be handed in a separate envelope from the one in which you hand in the report/protocol/video. On both packets/envelopes, make sure that you write the type and number of test, and your name (Mary Whipple, WISC-V #3). This way, we can make sure that every test had the proper consent/permission form handed in with it.

Additionally, all reports and protocols should be de-identified. That is, only pseudonyms (fictitious names) should be used. Be creative but appropriate in deciding your factitious monikers!

**Result: *No results generated from testing requirements for this class are to be disseminated to anyone other than the instructor and graduate assistants (this includes any portion of a written report).*** Because this course is a skill development course, it is probable that many, even most, of the test administrations will have some errors and, thus, limited reliability and validity. Therefore it is imperative that these reports NOT be used for decision-making purposes. Violations of this practice will be considered a serious breach of professional ethics. Curious parents or examinees can be told that it is being done only for training purposes and that you are not allowed, by policy, to give results. However, you can tell caregivers that the experience is meant to be a positive one, and tell possible subjects that the experience will be interesting, challenging, and maybe fun!

**Grading:**

Best 4 scores from your first 6, Non-Final, Protocols/administrations: **60 points**

3 "Non-Final" Written reports: **18 points (6 pts a piece)**

Presentation: **20 points**

Final Administration Protocol, Report, & Videotape: **35 points (25 for Admin and 10 for the final report)**

Participation: **15 points**

**Total: 148 points**

A = 94 – 100%

A- = 90-93%

B+ = 87-89%

B = 84 - 86%

B- = 80-83%

C+ = 77-79%

C = 74 -76%

C- = 70-73%

Etc.

**Projected Timeline:** (please note that this timeline is subject to change, as are specific readings. I will try to give ample forewarning if this happens):

**Course Schedule**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Reading</b>	<b>Due</b>
8/30	Introductions/Syllabus	Syllabus	
9/1	The Assessment Process Introduction; History & Theories	Sattler Ch 1, 2, & 7	
<b>9/6</b>	<b>Labor Day – NO Class</b>		
9/8	History & Theories, CONT.	Sattler, Ch. 7, CONT.; Gardner (1995); Frazier & Youngstrom (2007); Carroll (Ch. 4; 2005); Jie-Qi, J & Gardner, H. (2012); Horn & Blankson (2012)	
9/13	General Administrative Considerations; WISC-V Use	Sattler Ch. 6; Start to look over: Weis et al. (Ch 1; 2016)	<b>Likely lab week</b>

Date	Topic	Reading	Due
9/15	WISC-V Use, CONT.	Continue last week's & Sattler, Chs. 9, 10 (Description and administration)	Likely lab week
9/20	WISC-V Practice		Likely lab week
9/22	WISC-V Practice; Selected Statistical Concepts	Sattler, Ch. 4	Likely lab week
9/27	WISC-V Scoring & Analysis; Continue Selected Statistical Concepts	Sattler, Ch. 11	Likely Lab Week
9/29	WAIS-IV Use	Sattler & Ryan Chs 2 & 3	
10/4	WAIS-IV, CONT.		Likely Lab Week
10/6	WAIS scoring & Analysis; Wechsler Interpretation Basics	Sattler & Ryan Ch 4; Beal et al. (Ch 3, 2016)	Presentation Topics Due
10/11	Wechsler Interpretation: Critical Considerations	<b>Beal et al. cont. (Ch 3, 2016)- Read thoroughly &amp; SKIM THESE (I will go over main points):</b> Watkins, Glutting & Youngstrom (Ch. 12; 2005); Watkins & Canivez (2021; focus on the beginning and the General Discussion points) Hale & Fiorello (NASP Communique, 2002); Watkins, Glutting & Lei (2007); Gresham and Witt, (1997); Mather & Wendling (Ch. 23; 2012); Rogers, et al. (2011); Flanagan, Alfonso, & Ortiz (Ch 19, 2012; Especially Table 19.5)	1 <sup>st</sup> Protocol Due (WISC)
10/13	The GAI(?) WISC-V/WAIS-IV Report Writing	Sattler Ch 18; Kamphaus, Ch. 18;	
10/18	Report Writing Continued	Continue report writing readings from previous class;	
10/20	SB:V Overview, Technical Issues, and Administration	Sattler, Ch. 15	
10/25	SB:V Practice	Sattler, Ch. 15	2 <sup>nd</sup> Protocol Due
10/27	Heated Issues: Issues Pertaining to Race and IQ	Sattler, Ch. 5 & 8; Suzuki & Valencia (1997); Halpern (1997); Ceci and Williams, (1997);	

Date	Topic	Reading	Due
	(& Gender Differences); Malleability of Intelligence	Sternberg (1996); Williams (2013); Nisbett, et al. (2012); NASP piece on Implicit Bias, 2017: ( <a href="https://www.nasponline.org/resources-and-publications/resources-and-podcasts/diversity-and-social-justice/social-justice/implicit-bias-a-foundation-for-school-psychologists">https://www.nasponline.org/resources-and-publications/resources-and-podcasts/diversity-and-social-justice/social-justice/implicit-bias-a-foundation-for-school-psychologists</a> )	
11/1	Heated Issues (cont.- if needed); Ethical guidelines	Sattler Ch. 3; Ethics Activity: Please look up, and bring to class, both NASP and APA ethical guidelines regarding assessment  American Psychological Association (APA) Ethical Principles (see here for pdf format: <a href="https://www.apa.org/ethics/code/ethics-code-2017.pdf">https://www.apa.org/ethics/code/ethics-code-2017.pdf</a> )  National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) Professional Conduct Manual – find link to it here (NOTE that Ethics start on pg. 39 of the 2020 Professional Standards document): <a href="https://www.nasponline.org/standards-and-certification/professional-ethics">https://www.nasponline.org/standards-and-certification/professional-ethics</a>	
11/3	Ethics, cont.	Ethics Activity, cont.	
11/8	Presentation of WJ-IV Cog		<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Protocol (W/ Report)</b>
11/10	Assessing MR & LD	Kamphaus (Ch. 20; 2005); Spruill, Oakland & Harrison (Ch. 9; 2005); Macheck & Nelson (2007); Fiorello, Hale, & Wycoff (Ch. 20, 2012); Tanaka, et al. (2011); Shaywitz et al. (Ch. 9, 2016)	
11/15	Assessing MR & LD, cont.	Same as last week	
11/17	<b>Computer Scoring/ Case studies</b>		<b>4<sup>th</sup> Protocol (W/video &amp; Report) due</b>
11/22	<b>Computer Scoring/ Case studies</b>		
11/24	<b>Thanksgiving Holiday</b>	<b>NO Class</b>	

Date	Topic	Reading	Due
11/29	Presentations/Meetings		5 <sup>th</sup> Protocol (W/video & report) Due
12/1	Thanksgiving Holiday	NO Class	
12/6	Presentations		
12/8	Presentations		Final (6 <sup>th</sup> ) Due (W/ video, and report)

Please note that this syllabus is subject to change at the instructor's discretion.

### Scoring Rubric (Subject to Modifications)

#### Majors Errors

1. Inappropriate basal or ceiling
2. Incorrect computation(s) (e.g. summation of scaled scores or raw scores, incorrect computation of CA, incorrect transformation of standard scores, etc.)
3. Omission of Query/Prompt ***when indicated***
4. Omission of subtests (and make-up of subtest)
5. Incorrect transformation of standard scores
6. Administering wrong subtest (E.g.: Coding A/B)
7. Failure to give example or sample item where required
8. (administration of samples must be recorded on protocol)
9. Failure to use stimulus book if required (be careful of this, especially with Vocabulary)
10. Administering items or subtests in wrong order.
11. "Other" obvious situations that break from standardization, such as:
  - Not consistently reading the standardized instructions, teaching items, prompts, etc.

- MAJOR or MINOR, depending on severity: Poor physical set-up, such as too much extraneous noise/distractions, or severe deviation from physical set-up mentioned in administration manual.
- (I take into consideration that same things will be beyond your control, and that we will not always have the perfect environment)

### **Minors Errors**

1. Judgment, i.e., assignment of inappropriate credit or failure to give appropriate credit on items (Similarities, Vocab., Comp.)
2. Omission of Query
3. Wrong starting level
4. Misreading chart in recording percentiles
5. Time not recorded when necessary
6. Failure to appropriately record examinee's responses
7. Failure to provide all proper verbatim instructions (This is commonly encountered on L-NS on the WISC)
8. Doing ipsative analysis on "Overall" mean when there is a PRI-VCI discrepancy (stat. sig. AND low Base Rate), and vice versa.
9. "Other" basic administration errors, such as:
  - a. -incorrect base rates, percentiles, etc
  - b. -failure to present Block Design blocks properly, or failure to scramble blocks after each administration.
  - c. Consistently administering Digit Span items too quickly or too slowly.

This is likely not an exhaustive list. Errors encountered that do NOT accurately fit the above categories will be evaluated at the instructor and TA's discretion.

**Note:** If in reviewing your practice protocols you realize you made a mistake, note the error in the margin of the protocol and it will not be counted against you. This applies to all protocols except the final.

## **Possible Presentation Topics**

Assessment of Learning Disabilities: Past and present practices and related debate  
This would be an excellent choice for a school psych student.

Assessment of the deaf and hard of hearing

Assessment of the visually impaired or blind

The presentation of an individually administered intelligence test not covered in this class

- The Universal Nonverbal Intelligence Test (UNIT)

- The Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence, Third Edition (WPPSI-III)

- The Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (WASI)

- WJ-IV Test of Cognitive Abilities

- KABC

Assessment of cognitive giftedness

Ceiling effects and other issues specific to the testing of intellectually gifted students

Issues in the intellectual testing of NA students

Emotional Intelligence

The use of individual norm-referenced tests of intelligence in the determination of specific learning disabilities

A look at cultural bias in intelligence testing: evidence for and against

Best Practices in using IQ tests with culturally and/or linguistically diverse populations

Issues in assessing Preschoolers with IQ tests

Cognitive changes throughout the lifespan

A thorough presentation on a specific theory of intelligence

- Gardner's Multiple Intelligences

- Sternberg's Triarchic theory

- PASS (Planning, Attention, Simultaneous, Successive) Theory

## CHC (Cattell-Horn-Carroll) Theory of cognitive abilities

Nature vs. Nurture in intelligence

An elucidation on historical perspectives and influences not covered in class

**Note: I have texts, articles, or chapters, for most of these subjects. So, please inquire into these to help get you started.**

### **Bibliography of Readings**

Beal, A. L., Holdnack, J. A., Saklofske, D. H., & Weiss, L. G. (2016). Practical considerations in WISC-V interpretation and intervention. In Weiss, L. G., Saklofske, D. H., Holdnack, J. A. & Prifitera, A. (Eds.) *WISC-V Assessment and Interpretation*. Academic Press: London.

Carroll, J. (2005). The Three Stratum theory of cognitive abilities. In Flanagan, D. P., & Harrison, P. L. (Eds.). *Contemporary Intellectual Assessment--Theories, Tests, and Issues* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press

Ceci, S. J., & Williams, W. M. (1997). Schooling, intelligence, and income. *American Psychologist*, 52 (10), 1051-1058.

Fiorello, C. A., Hale, J. B., & Wycoff, K. L. (2012). Cognitive Hypothesis Testing: Linking test results to the real world. In Flanagan, D. P., & Harrison, P. L. (Eds.). *Contemporary Intellectual Assessment--Theories, Tests, and Issues* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Flanagan, D. P., Alfonso, V. C., & Ortiz, S. O. (2012). The cross battery assessment approach: An overview, historical perspective, and current directions. In Flanagan, D. P., & Harrison, P. L. (Eds.). *Contemporary Intellectual Assessment--Theories, Tests, and Issues* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Frazier, T.W., & Youngstrom, E.A. (2007). Historical increase in the number of factors measured by commercial test of cognitive ability: Are we overfactoring? *Intelligence*, 35, 169-182.

Gardner, H. (1995). Reflections on multiple intelligences. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 77(3), 200-208.

Gresham, F.M., & Witt, J.C. (1997). Utility of intelligence tests for treatment planning, classification, and placement decisions: Recent empirical findings and future directions. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 12, 249-267.



Hale, J. B. & Fiorello, C. A. (2002). Beyond the academic rhetoric of g: Intelligence testing guidelines for practitioners. *The School Psychologist*, 55(4) 113-139.

Halpern, D. E. (1997). Sex differences in intelligence. *American Psychologist*, 52 (10), 1091-1102.

Horn, J. I. & Blankson, A. N. (2012). Foundations for better understanding of cognitive abilities. In Flanagan, D. P., & Harrison, P. L. (Eds.). *Contemporary Intellectual Assessment--Theories, Tests, and Issues* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Jie-Qi, J & Gardner, H. (2012). Assessment of Intellectual Profile: A perspective from multiple-intelligences theory. In Flanagan, D. P., & Harrison, P. L. (Eds.). *Contemporary Intellectual Assessment--Theories, Tests, and Issues* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Kamphaus, R. (2005). *Clinical Assessment of Child and Adolescent Intelligence*. New York: Springer.

Machek, G. R., & Nelson, J.M. (2007). How should reading disabilities be operationalized?: A national survey of school psychologists. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 22, 147-157.

Machek, G. R., & Nelson, J. M. (2010). School Psychologists' Perceptions Regarding the Practice of Identifying Reading Disabilities: Cognitive Assessment and Response to Intervention Considerations. *Psychology in the Schools*, 47(3), 230-245.

Mather, N., & Wendling, B. J. (2005). Linking cognitive assessment results to academic interventions for students with learning disabilities. In Flanagan, D. P., & Harrison, P. L. (Eds.). *Contemporary Intellectual Assessment--Theories, Tests, and Issues* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

National Association of School Psychologists. (2017). *Implicit bias: A foundation for school psychologists* [handout]. Bethesda, MD: Author.

Nisbett, R. E., Aronson, J., Blair, C., Dickens, W., Flynn, J., Halpern, D.F., & Turheimer, E. (2012). Intelligence: New findings and theoretical developments. *American Psychologist*, 67, 2, 130-159.

Rogers, M., Hwang, H., Toplak, M., Weiss, M., & Tannock, R. (2011). Inattention, working memory, and academic achievement in adolescents referred for attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). *Child Neuropsychology*, 17:5, 444-458.

Sattler, J.M., (2008). *Assessment of Children: Cognitive Foundations, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition*. San Diego, CA: Jerome Sattler Press.

Shaywitz, B. A., Weiss, L. G., Saklofske, D. H., & Shaywitz, S. E. (2016). Translating scientific progress in dyslexia into the twenty-first century diagnosis and interventions. In Weiss, L. G., Saklofske, D. H., Holdnack, J. A. & Prifitera, A. (Eds.) WISC-V Assessment and Interpretation. Academic Press: London.

Spruill, Oakland, & Harrison (2005). Assessment of mental retardation. In Prifitera, A, Saklofske, D. H., & Weiss, L. G. (Eds.) WISC-IV Clinical Use and Interpretation. Burlington, MA: Elsevier Academic Press.

Sternberg, R. (1996). Myths, countermyths and truths about intelligence, *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp.11-16.

Suzuki, L., & Valencia, R. R. (1997). Race-ethnicity and measured intelligence: Educational implications. *American Psychologist* 52, 1103–1114.

Tanaka, H., Black, J., Hulme, C., Stanley, L., Kesler, S., Whitfield-Gabrieli, S., Gabrieli, J., Hoeft, F. (2011). Brain Basis of Phonological Deficit in Dyslexia is Independent of IQ. *Psychological Science*. 22, 1442-1451

Wahlstrom, D., Weiss, L. G., & Saklofske, D. H. (2016). Practical Issues in WISC-V administration and scoring. In Weiss, L. G., Saklofske, D. H., Holdnack, J. A. & Prifitera, A. (Eds.) WISC-V Assessment and Interpretation. Academic Press: London.

Watkins, M. W., Glutting, J. J., & Lei, P.-W. (2007). Validity of the full scale IQ when there is significant variability among WISC-III and WISC-IV factor scores. *Applied Neuropsychology*, 14, 13-20.

Watkins, M. W., Glutting, J. J., & Youngstrom, E. A. (2005). Issues in subtest profile analysis. In Flanagan, D. P., & Harrison, P. L. (Eds.) Contemporary Intellectual Assessment--Theories, Tests, and Issues (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press

Weiss, L. G., Saklofske, D. H., & Holdnack, J. A. (2016). WISC-V: Advances in the assessment of intelligence. In Weiss, L. G., Saklofske, D. H., Holdnack, J. A. & Prifitera, A. (Eds.) WISC-V Assessment and Interpretation. Academic Press: London.

Williams, R. L. (2013). Overview of the Flynn effect. *Intelligence*. 41, 753-764.

**Other Readings to Consider:**

Neisser, U. (1997). Rising scores on intelligence tests. *American Scientist*, 85, 440-447.